

## **LOUISIANA TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION COUNCIL**

**2/14/00**

Members present: Don Hutchinson, Butch Speer, Bob Harper, Jerry Guillot, and Bill Beyer

Butch Speer called meeting to order. Quorum was established. Floor was opened for nominations for Chair. J. Guillot nominated Don Hutchinson as Chair. B. Beyer seconded the nomination. Council members introduced themselves. Tom Burkes (DOA), Technical Advisor was also present.

D. Hutchinson called for a motion for approval of minutes from September 29, 1999. B. Speer moved that the minutes be approved as written. B. Beyer seconded motion.

D. Hutchinson outlined items on the agenda which included a brief overview of the legislation which created the La. Technology Innovation Council in 1997. Initial appropriation was \$10 million. Legislation requires that the Council meet on a quarterly basis. Since the Council first met, they have received 34 applications—12 being approved.

As of January, 2000, the interest earnings on the Fund were \$1.1million since 1997 to date, Mr. Hutchinson stated. The total of the fund is \$11.1 million. Not included in the \$11.1 is a transfer of \$3 million in tobacco settlement receipts. In the 1999 legislative session, there is an earmark in the Capital Outlay bill of \$3 million of the tobacco monies for the technology fund.

D. Hutchinson discussed the guidelines for the TIF. He pointed out there are proposed changes in draft form that were distributed to the council members. The council should encourage state agencies to follow the guidelines when submitting a proposal. The guidelines suggest a higher priority be given to those projects either Internet-based or Web driven and also where there is collaboration between state agencies.

J. Guillot asked if the Council was contemplating applying the additional guideline items to the applications that have been previously submitted that will be presented on Thursday.

D. Hutchinson stated the new guideline items would be added to new proposals that are received after Thursday's meeting. These new guidelines will be placed on the web site after being adopted by the Council.

B. Harper stated there is a \$1 million limit per each proposal, but asked if there was a total draw into the fund per each department. D. Hutchinson stated there was no limit on the total draw per department, there is a limit of \$1 million per proposal. B. Harper asked if part of the selection criteria should be that substantial funds have been made available to a department before. He further asked if that was part of the selection criteria. D. Hutchinson stated no.

D. Hutchinson discussed a change in procedures in regard to submission of applications. He stated when possible, state agencies should submit a copy of their request to the Chairman of the Council. He opened the floor for discussion relative to the delivery of the applications to the members. He stated the hope that state agencies would submit proposals electronically when at all possible.

B. Speer urged each council member to retain the language that applications should be submitted to the council chairman. He stated in the past, each council member initially received the proposals from the agencies. Evaluations from the DOA's IT staff and budgetary reviews from the Office of Planning and Budget were forwarded at a later time. He suggested the proposal, reviews from the DOA's IT staff and the Office of Planning and Budget be submitted together in a packet to each council member in a timely manner before the next scheduled meeting. B. Beyer concurred with B. Speer's comments. It was agreed that each proposal would be submitted to the Chair (5 copies). After the appropriate reviews were completed, the entire packet would be forwarded to the council members.

D. Hutchinson asked Tom Burkes to discuss the review process of the proposals. He explained that after he receives the initial proposal, he has two technical staff members in the Division review each one. After the proposal is reviewed independently, the three meet and decide on the response to be given. After the review is completed, it is forwarded to Marian Patterson (DOA) and she makes appropriate copies and forwards to the council members. The same is done with the Budget Office reviews. The Budget Office renders a fiscal opinion of the proposal.

B. Speer moved to adopt the Guidelines as presented and discussed. B. Harper seconds the motion. Motion passes.

Project scorecard was next item on agenda. Each time the council meets, an update will be provided on the status of projects that have been approved earlier by the council,

D. Hutchinson stated. He elaborated on the color coding system of the scorecard—blue dot means the project is complete; red means 35% or more of the project is incomplete. Another suggestion that was not included on the scorecard was to add under the project name category or the award amount category, the date the proposal was approved to enable the council members to see how much time has elapsed. This approval date would suggest if the agency is making progress, do they need to be called to see if there are problems, etc. Agencies are to submit a status report on their project every six months, the project scorecard quarterly.

J. Guillot asked the possibility of adding some type of code relative to justification as to why an agency did not meet deadlines as indicated in the project scorecard. D. Hutchinson stated this would be added to the scorecard.

J. Guillot made a motion to adopt project scorecard. B. Harper seconds motion. Motion adopted relative to project scorecard.

Next item to be discussed was the Draw Request. D. Hutchinson stated that in some instances, all monies were awarded up front and some partially. The draw request is to indicate to council when they are drawing the monies from the fund so the council will have a better understanding of the balance of the fund. The draw request form would be completed by the awardee and submitted when they want to withdraw funds.

B. Harper asked if there should be an area in the policy where there are limits for draws for actual cash needs. D. Hutchinson said yes. B. Beyer asked if this meant he did not want the agency to take the money up front and spend it as they need it. B. Harper stated yes.

D. Hutchinson further explained, for example, if the full amount of money approved for a proposal is given to an agency and the agency does not use any money for six months, if the money were to stay in the fund, the money would earn interest and help the life of the fund.

J. Guillot stated that if a motion was passed with the intent that wording should be inserted in the Memorandum of Understanding, that no monies shall be expended until needed. If a problem comes up with the agency, let the agency make a request to the Council deviating from the standard provisions. He moved that it become the policy of the Council to require applicants to submit draws for the release of funds and there should be a provision in the Memorandum of Understanding between the Division and the applicant that funds will be released at the time of need. Any variance from that would be subject to Council vote. B. Beyer seconds motion by J. Guillot. No objection.

Next item was discussion of the Annual Report. D. Hutchinson stated this was an attachment especially for the new members to give them an idea of what the Council has done and detail of projects that have been approved. The annual report will give background information and intent of the project.

D. Hutchinson stated next item on agenda was next meeting date. Next meeting is February 17, 2000. Seven proposals have been submitted and will be presented at that meeting.

No further business. B. Harper made a motion to adjourn. B. Beyer seconded motion. Meeting adjourned.

